

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 7 and 28 are pending. By this Amendment, claims 1, 4, and 28 are amended. No new matter is added.

Support for the amendments to claims 1, 4, and 28 is found, at least, in paragraph [0031] of the Specification.

For the following reasons, reconsideration is respectfully requested.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103:

On page 3, item 4 of the Office Action, claims 1, 4, 6, and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yeates et al. (U.S. Patent 5,644,782), in view of Kullick et al. (U.S. Patent 5,751,997). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

It is respectfully submitted that none of Yeates, Kullick, or their combination, disclose or suggest that the date and time of the last update are those generated by the server, as called for in claims 1 and 4, or that the first and second dates and times are those generated by the server, as called for in claim 28.

It is acknowledged on page 4 of the Office Action that Yeates is deficient, but Kullick is applied as providing for the deficiency of Yeates. Applicants respectfully disagree.

In the passages cited in the Office Action, Kullick fails to disclose or suggest that the date and time of the last update are those generated by the server or that the first and second dates and times are those generated by the server. Rather, Kullick simply discloses sending a full index 36 containing a date last modified field 60 between computer devices 18, and storage devices 14 and 16 (see, col. 5, lines 55-61, col. 7, line 25-col. 8, line 28, and FIGS. 3A-4D of Kullick). Kullick fails to specify the generator of the date and time of the last update, or the first and second dates and times.

Accordingly, because Yeates, Kullick, or their combination fails to disclose or suggest that the date and time of the last update are those generated by the server or that the first and second dates and times are those generated by the server, claims 1, 4, and 28 are patentably distinguishable over the applied references, or their combination. Claim 6, which depend from claim 6, is likewise patentably distinguishable over the applied reference to Yeates, Kullick, or their combination for at least the reasons discussed above, and for the additional features it recites. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

On page 7, item 5 of the Office Action, claims 3 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yeates, in view of Kullick, in further view of Alloul et al. (U.S. Patent 6,032,130). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

As discussed above, Yeates, in view of Kullick, fails to disclose or suggest each and every feature of claims 1 and 4, from which claims 3 and 7 respectively depend. As Alloul is allegedly directed to electronic transactions involving purchase orders, Alloul fails to overcome the deficiencies in Yeates, Kullick, or their combination. Accordingly, claims 3 and 7 are patentably distinguishable over the applied reference to Yeates, Kullick, Alloul, or their combination for at least their dependence from their respective independent claims, and for the additional features they recite. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION:

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 503333.

Respectfully submitted,

STEIN, MCEWEN & BUI, LLP

Date: 8/2/2007

By: Seth S. Kim
Seth S. Kim
Registration No. 54,577

1400 Eye St., N.W.
Suite 300
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 216-9505
Facsimile: (202) 216-9510